

**NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS**

California Rules of Court, rule 8.1115(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 8.1115(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.

COURT OF APPEAL, FOURTH APPELLATE DISTRICT

DIVISION ONE

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

In re ALVIN D., a Person Coming Under  
the Juvenile Court Law.

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

ALVIN D.,

Defendant and Appellant.

D054744

(Super. Ct. No. J212539)

APPEAL from a judgment of the Superior Court of San Diego County, Amalia L.  
Meza, Judge. Affirmed.

The juvenile court declared Alvin D. a ward of the court (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 602) after making true findings on allegations he received a stolen vehicle (Pen. Code, § 496d) and possessed a false vehicle registration card (Pen. Code, § 4463). The court placed Alvin on probation for one year and ordered him to complete 10 days of public service work.

## FACTS

On November 5, 2007, U.S. Customs officer Michael Paulo stopped a 2003 Hummer H-2 leaving Mexico at the primary inspection checkpoint of the San Ysidro port of entry. Two uncharged minors were in the Hummer, which did not have license plates. When asked by Paulo why the vehicle was without license plates, the minors gave the officer a California vehicle registration document. Paulo ran a computer check of the document, which showed the registration was for a Lexus and not a Hummer. Paulo detained the minors at the secondary inspection area and contacted the California Highway Patrol (CHP) for further investigation.

CHP officer Michael May responded and inspected the Hummer. May also did a computer check on the vehicle identification number (VIN) listed on the registration document and learned there was no match or record for the VIN. May next checked the license number listed on the registration document, which showed the license number was for a Lexus. May looked for the Hummer VIN in several areas of the vehicle and determined the federal label attached to the driver's side door was fraudulent. With the assistance of another CHP officer, May found the actual VIN and ran a computer check, which showed the Hummer was reported stolen. May also found license plates to a 1995 Land Rover inside the Hummer.

After interviewing the two minors who had been in the Hummer, May telephoned Alvin, whose name was on the registration document, and asked him to come to the border to discuss the vehicle. Alvin refused to come to the border.

Alvin was interviewed the following day and gave four different versions of his connection to the Hummer. First, Alvin said he had met a couple of friends at a parking lot in Tijuana, where he saw the Hummer for the first time. His friends drove the Hummer to San Diego and he stayed in Tijuana.

After the officers brought up the registration document with his name, Alvin told them he had been at a friend's house in Tijuana when a man showed up with the Hummer. Alvin believed his friend was going to purchase the Hummer. Alvin said he had no idea why his name was on the registration card because he was not the one purchasing the vehicle. Alvin said he and two other friends then met in a parking lot in Tijuana to pick up the Hummer for the friend who was going to purchase it.

When the officers told Alvin that the two minors who had been detained at the border made contrary statements, Alvin related a different version of the events in which he was the one who was going to purchase the Hummer for \$20,000. Alvin said he thought there might be a problem with the Hummer because the registration document card was false and he had provided the license number on the document; the license number belonged to a Land Rover that he owned. Alvin said he was going to use the license plates for the Land Rover to get the Hummer across the border.

Alvin next told the officers that he was in the Hummer as he and his friends were driving the vehicle to the border, but he left the vehicle before they reached the checkpoints and walked across the border.

## DISCUSSION

Appointed appellate counsel has filed a brief summarizing the facts and proceedings below. Counsel presents no argument for reversal, but asks this court to review the record for error as mandated by *People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436. Pursuant to *Anders v. California* (1967) 386 U.S. 738, counsel refers to as possible but not arguable issues: (1) whether the juvenile court had jurisdiction over the two charged offenses where Alvin's participation, if any, took place in Mexico; and (2) whether substantial evidence supports a finding that the vehicle was a stolen vehicle.

We granted Alvin permission to file a brief on his own behalf. He has not responded.

A review of the record pursuant to *People v. Wende, supra*, 25 Cal.3d 436, and *Anders v. California, supra*, 386 U.S. 738, including the possible issues referred to by appellate counsel, has disclosed no reasonably arguable appellate issues. Alvin has been adequately represented by counsel on this appeal.

## DISPOSITION

The judgment is affirmed.

---

IRION, J.

WE CONCUR:

---

NARES, Acting P. J.

---

O'ROURKE, J.